

REMARKS

The Official Action mailed March 10, 2006, has been received and its contents carefully noted. This response is filed within three months of the mailing date of the Official Action and therefore is believed to be timely without extension of time. Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully submits that this response is being timely filed.

The Applicant notes with appreciation the consideration of the Information Disclosure Statements filed on February 11, 2004; and December 21, 2005. A further Information Disclosure Statement is submitted herewith and consideration of this Information Disclosure Statement is respectfully requested.

Claims 2-37 are pending in the present application, of which claims 2-9 are independent. Claims 2-9 have been amended to better recite the features of the present invention. For the reasons set forth in detail below, all claims are believed to be in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration is requested.

The Official Action asserts that "[this] application filed under former 37 CFR 1.60 lacks the necessary reference to the prior application" (page 2, Paper No. 20060303). The Applicant respectfully disagrees. Initially, it is noted that the present application was not "filed under former 37 CFR 1.60" as asserted in the Official Action. Also, under 37 CFR § 1.76(b)(5), the Applicant may provide domestic priority information in an application data sheet and such disclosure "constitutes the specific reference required by 35 U.S.C. 119(e) or 120, and § 1.78(a)(2) or § 1.78(a)(4), and need not otherwise be made part of the specification." The Applicant respectfully submits that the application data sheet, which appears in the Image File Wrapper, includes a specific reference to the prior application and fully complies with Rule 1.76. The Applicant respectfully requests that the objection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

The Official Action rejects claims 2-9 and 30-37 as obvious based on U.S. Patent No. 6,219,113 to Takahara. The Applicant respectfully submits that a *prima facie* case of obviousness cannot be maintained against the independent claims of the present application, as amended.

As stated in MPEP §§ 2142-2143.01, to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. Obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either explicitly or implicitly in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. "The test for an implicit showing is what the combined teachings, knowledge of one of ordinary skill in the art, and the nature of the problem to be solved as a whole would have suggested to those of ordinary skill in the art." In re Kotzab, 217 F.3d 1365, 1370, 55 USPQ2d 1313, 1317 (Fed. Cir. 2000). See also In re Fine, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988); In re Jones, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992).

The prior art, either alone or in combination, does not teach or suggest all the features of the independent claims, as amended. Independent claims 2, 3, 6 and 7 have been amended to recite a dividing circuit over a substrate, for dividing a signal into n signals, and inputting the n signals to n pixels among a plurality of pixels through n video input signal lines. Similarly, independent claims 4, 5, 8 and 9 have been amended to recite a dividing circuit over a substrate, for dividing three signals corresponding to colors R, G and B into $3n$ signals, and inputting the $3n$ signals to $3n$ pixels among a plurality of pixels through $3n$ video input signal lines. These features are supported in the present specification, for example, by page 6, line 22, through page 8, line 3, and Figures 1 and 2. Although Takahara appears to teach a signal dividing circuit 2165 in Figure 216, Takahara but does not teach or suggest n or $3n$ video signal lines, much less that signal dividing circuit 2165 inputs n or $3n$ signals through n or $3n$


video signal lines. Therefore, Takahara does not teach or suggest a dividing circuit over a substrate, for dividing a signal into n signals, and inputting the n signals to n pixels among a plurality of pixels through n video input signal lines or a dividing circuit over a substrate, for dividing three signals corresponding to colors R, G and B into $3n$ signals, and inputting the $3n$ signals to $3n$ pixels among a plurality of pixels through $3n$ video input signal lines.

Since Takahara does not teach or suggest all the claim limitations, a *prima facie* case of obviousness cannot be maintained. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) are in order and respectfully requested.

The Official Action rejects dependent claims 10-29 as obvious based on the combination of Takahara and U.S. Patent No. 6,115,097 to Yamazaki. Please incorporate the arguments above with respect to the deficiencies in Takahara. Yamazaki does not cure the deficiencies in Takahara. The Official Action relies on Yamazaki to allegedly teach the features of the dependent claims. Specifically, the Official Action relies on Yamazaki to alleged teach "a data line driver circuit comprising a shift register, NAND circuits, a level shifter and a buffer ...; a substrate 401 comprising glass ...; and a thin film transistor comprising polycrystalline silicon film" (page 8, Paper No. 20060303). However, Takahara and Yamazaki, either alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest that Takahara should have n or $3n$ video signal lines, much less that signal dividing circuit 2165 should input n or $3n$ signals through n or $3n$ video signal lines. Since Takahara and Yamazaki do not teach or suggest all the claim limitations, a *prima facie* case of obviousness cannot be maintained. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) are in order and respectfully requested.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable to place this application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,



Eric J. Robinson
Reg. No. 38,285

Robinson Intellectual Property Law Office, P.C.
PMB 955
21010 Southbank Street
Potomac Falls, Virginia 20165
(571) 434-6789